

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 19-21, which are all of the pending claims, over the prior art, primarily U.S. patent application publication no. 2002/0099829 (Richards, et al.). Specifically, Claims 1, 6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being fully anticipated by Richards, et al; and Claims 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Richards, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,834,297 (Peiffer, et al.). Claims 1 and 11 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and as failing to comply with the enablement requirement; and Claims 19-21 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The rejections of the claims over the prior art and the rejection of Claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite are respectfully traversed. Editorial corrections are being made to Claims 1, 11, 20 and 21, and Claim 20 is also being emended to describe an optional feature of the preferred embodiment of the invention. These editorial corrections address the rejections of Claims 11 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

More specifically, in rejecting Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the Examiner objected to the phrase "shortening receiving identifiers within the file." In this phrase, "receiving" should be "recurring," and Claims 1 and 11 are being amended to correct this. As the Examiner noted in the Office Action, the specification teaches shortening recurring identifiers, at for example, page 3, lines 9 and 10. This change overcomes the rejection of Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and the Examiner is respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw this rejection.

The rejection of Claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112 is respectfully traversed because independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 provide the appropriate antecedent basis for the term “pre-identified subject matter” in Claims 19-21. To elaborate, in the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 19-21 recite the limitation “said pre-identified subject matter,” and the Examiner argued that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. Claims 19-21 are dependent from Claim 1, 6 and 11 respectively, and each of these latter claims sets forth the limitation of “removing pre-identified subject matter.” This limitation occurs in Claim 1 at lines 7 and 8, in Claim 6 at line 8, and in Claim 11 at lines 8 and 9. Thus, Claims 1, 6 and 11 provide the appropriate antecedent basis for the use of the phrase “said pre-identified subject matter” in Claims 19-21.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 are also traversed. This is because the prior art does not disclose or suggest reducing the size of a web content file, in order to prepare that file for downloading over a computer network, by identifying logic blocks that are unused in the file and removing these identified unused logic blocks.

As discussed in detail in the present application, the instant invention provides methods and systems for preparing files for downloading over computer networks, and more specifically, for reducing the size of files before downloading the files. In accordance with the present invention, the size of the file is reduced by removing pre-identified matter, including both renderable and non-renderable data, from the file. For example, unused logic blocks are removed, recurring identifiers are shortened, and duplicated logic blocks are consolidated.

Reducing the size of the file is not as easy as simply taking data out, though. Procedures need to be designed and put in place that can be used to determine what data to remove. For example, in order to remove unused logic blocks, the present invention first identifies logic blocks that are unused and then removes those unused blocks.

The references of record do not show or suggest reducing the size of a web content file, in order to prepare that file for downloading over a computer network, by identifying logic blocks that are unused in the file and removing those identified, unused logic blocks.

In particular, Richards, et al. discloses a filter proxy system for comprehensive content acceleration and automated content formatting. The disclosed system provides means and mechanisms for establishing, entering, updating and retrieving device and user profiles specification and templates in the respective database; and analyzing the markup (ML) language while applying the specifications of the device and user profiles to determine what data formatting filters and/or compression filters are required. This disclosed system also provided means and mechanisms for analyzing of the ML language while applying the specifications of the device and user profiles to define an ML template or establish the best fit of an existing ML template to further refine the process of re-purposing, re-authoring and formatting the ML and its content for a specific device and user.

In paragraphs 49-121, Richards, et al. lists components, functions and filters that are incorporated into one embodiment of a filter proxy system. For example, paragraph 92 specifically identifies “ML re-authoring and editing filters and logic as required by pro-files and template parameters.

Thus, while Richards, et al. refers in a very general way to “logic,” there is no teaching or suggestion of determining logic blocks that are unused and then removing those unused logic blocks.

The other references of record, whether considered individually or in combination, also do not disclose or teach this principal.

For instance, Peiffer, et al. discloses a procedure for accelerating data transmission over a computer network, and, in particular, filtering data from a web resource to increase the speed at which this resource can be transmitted over a network. In this procedure, a portion of an original web resource is processed to form a size-optimized web resource having a smaller file size than the original web resource, and that size-optimized web resource is sent to the remote client.

Peiffer, et al, in the Abstract and in column 2, indicates that the data that are filtered may include whitespace, comments, hard returns, meta tags, keywords, or other data. With the Peiffer, et al. process, though, no determination is made as to whether a particular hard return is or is not used. Instead, with the procedure described in Peiffer, et al, it is assumed that certain ASCII characters are not rendered by a browser, and thus these characters are removed (Peiffer, et al, column 9, lines 11-20.).

It is important to emphasize that there is a significant difference between removing unused logic blocks, such as is done with the present invention, and removing other types of data, such as whitespaces and comments, such as are mentioned in Richards, et al and Peiffer, et al. Specifically, these other types of data can be removed automatically wherever they are found; while logic blocks cannot – at least not without possibly significantly adversely affecting the way the data is shown or rendered. Before a logic block can be removed, it must first be

determined, as mentioned above, whether the logic block is or is not unused.

The present invention does this; the prior art does not.


Claims 1, 6 and 11 describe the above-discussed feature of this invention. Each of these claims describes the feature of identifying unused logic blocks in the web content file, and removing those identified, unused logic blocks from that file. Moreover, each of these claims, as presented herewith, positively sets forth the limitation that these unused logic blocks are functions that are in the file but not used.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 6 and 11 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, it cannot be said that any of these claims is anticipated by or is obvious in view of the prior art. Accordingly, Claims 1, 6 and 11 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 19-21 are dependent from Claims 1, 6 and 11, respectively, and are allowable therewith. The Examiner is thus respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and the rejection of Claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow Claims 1, 6, 11 and 19-21.

For the reasons discussed above, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103, second paragraph, and the rejection of Claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The Examiner is, in addition, asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and the rejection of Claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow claims 1, 6, 11 and 19-21.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

  
John S. Sensny  
Registration No. 28,757  
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 7472-4343

JSS:jy